

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-2, 5-6, 8-12, 15-16, and 18-19 remain pending in this application. For at least the reasons stated below, Applicants assert that all claims are in condition for allowance.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Submitted herewith are copies of the five references cited in PTO Form 1449, filed as paper number 29, but indicated by the Examiner as not having a copy provided to the Patent Office. The submitted "other documents" cited on the PTO Form 1449 are:

- a) Clausnitzer et al., 'On the application of parallel database technology for large scale document management systems'
- b) Cooper, 'More than just hits'
- c) Maes, 'Agents that reduce work and information overload'
- d) Ng, 'Card companies are testing the many applications of smart cards for travel and entertainment'
- E) Shapira et al. 'Stereotypes in information filtering systems'.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8-12, 15, 16, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chrabaszez*, U.S. Patent No. 6,202,083 in view of *Harris et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,331,972. Applicant opposes this rejection.

Chrabaszez discloses a method for updating wallpaper for a computer display. Reading the entire disclosure of *Chrabaszez* shows that *Chrabaszez*

teaches quite a different application of user profiles than Applicant. Specifically, in *Chrabaszez*, upon receiving a request for a wallpaper display, a fetching mechanism references a distributed user database to determine a personal profile for the user who generated the request. The personal profile is used to select a wallpaper from a picture database. See col. 4, lines 48-51. The personal profile may contain information on what items and areas the user has referenced in the past and the user's security rights.

To the contrary, Applicant's invention offers the user a single centralized user profile that is easily accessible from anywhere, which takes the place of many user profiles set up and used by the user for various applications. Under Applicant's invention, the user is able to set up a user profile so that a subset of the user profile information may be shared with third parties, as claimed by Applicant. Third parties are other users, or merchants that offer products, services, and/or content. At any point, third parties can access the user profile from the central database to discover the user's upcoming Activities. The third parties can then deliver to the database relevant content. Later, the user can access this newly stored content. In the case of a PDA, for example, the user can synchronize the PDA so that both the PDA and the central database have a current version of the user profile information and the content. This is quite different that the operation of *Chrabaszez*. It appears from the outstanding Office Action that the Examiner is not considering the full disclosure of *Chrabaszez*.

Chrabaszez fails to disclose or suggest obtaining user profile information from a shared centralized profile, wherein the profile information is calendar information, e-mail messages, contact information, task info, or notes, as claimed by Applicant. Contrary to statements in the outstanding Office Action, no where does *Chrabaszez* disclose or suggest a calendar, email, contact list, task list, note. The Examiner is correct in stating that *Chrabaszez* fails to disclose third party access to the database. Applicant's third party access, is not another device or remote access via the Internet.

The third party access, as claimed by Applicant, is an entity or person, other than the user having access to the user's profile and information (*emphasis added*).

Furthermore, *Chrabaszez* discloses a subdivided web site containing a public space and a private space. See Figure 2. Any user or person with access to the system can access information in the public space. The public space contains information such as news, sports, and community information. See col. 3, lines 54-67. However, only a user with authorization (*i.e.*, a password) has access to the private space. The private space contains an individual user's personal information, such as, member lists, family reunion information, and the like. See col. 4, lines 1-25. Whereas, in Applicant's invention, the user has a user profile made up of a set of attributes. Both the user profile and Activities (such as personal calendar information, e-mail messages, contact information, task info, or notes) are stored on a central database. The user can access this information anywhere via an Internet enabled device – such as with a Palm Pilot PDA or cell telephone. Additionally, other people have access to the user's profile and Activities.

As an example, under Applicant's invention, the user may have a lunch date scheduled on her electronic calendar. This information is stored in the user's profile in a central database. The user may give permission to a third party to access this personal user data. The restaurant, a friend, and a local arts magazine may all access the user's personal data from the database. Then the restaurant may transmit to the database an electronic coupon for a free dessert. The friend may transmit to the database a message that he will be in the restaurant's neighborhood for the afternoon and is available for coffee. The arts magazine may transmit to the database a recent review of the restaurant.

Later in the morning, the user may synch her PDA with the central database and thus move to the database her new appointments and

contacts, while moving to the PDA the content provided by the friend, the restaurant and the magazine. These activities are not disclosed or contemplated by *Chrabaszez*.

Accordingly, for the above-indicated reasons *Chrabaszez* fails to disclose or suggest all the limitations of claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8-12, 15, 16, 18 and 19.

Furthermore, *Harris et al.* discloses a method for personalizing an electronic device through a personal area network. *Harris et al.* discloses remote device access to a system. However, **reading the entire disclosure of *Harris et al.*** shows that *Harris et al.* teaches quite a different application of third party access. *Harris et al.* discloses user access to a system via a remote or third party electronic device. Specifically, *Harris et al.* discloses the transmission of messages between remote/third party electronic devices to configure the third party electronic device to display the user data from the system. An identification code is necessary for the user to receive access to their user profile on the system and to receive the configuration transmission to display data on the remote electronic device. This is different from Applicant's invention as claimed. *Harris et al.* does not disclose a third party (an entity other than the user) having access to the user profile, as claimed by Applicant. *Harris et al.* discloses the user having the ability to access the system and their user profile from a third party device.

Harris et al. fails to disclose or suggest third party (other than the user) accessing of a central database to access user profile information. Moreover, *Harris et al.* fails to disclose or suggest public access to a subset of the user profile information and Activities, as claimed by Applicant.

Accordingly, for the above-indicated reasons *Harris et al.*, alone or in combination with *Chrabaszez*, fails to disclose or suggest all the limitations of claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8-12, 15, 16, 18 and 19. Moreover, there is a lack of motivation to combine the two above references. Nothing in either reference

suggests the combination of the two references to teach remote third party (other than the user) access to a user's profile.

Thus, the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of the claims is improper. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8-12, 15, 16, 18 and 19.

Conclusion

For at least the reasons stated above, Applicant submits that all pending claims are now allowable over the art of record and respectfully requests that a Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes that a conference would be of value in expediting the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number listed below.

Should any additional fees be necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge or credit any such fees or overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1901 (Reference #60021-303001).

Respectfully submitted,

By W. Glenn Edwards
W. Glenn Edwards, Reg. #44,426
Oppenheimer Wolff & Donnelly LLP
1400 Page Mill Road
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1124
Telephone: 612.607.7278
Facsimile: 612.607.7100
E-mail: WEdwards@oppenheimer.com